Reaching Agreement in Quantum Hybrid Networks

Guodong Shi, Bo Li, Zibo Miao, Peter M. Dower, and Matthew R. James*†‡

arXiv:1607.02824v1 [quant-ph] 11 Jul 2016

Abstract

We consider a basic quantum hybrid network model consisting of a number of nodes each holding a qubit, for which the aim is to drive the network to a consensus in the sense that all qubits reach a common state. Projective measurements are applied serving as control means, and the measurement results are exchanged among the nodes via classical communication channels. We show how to carry out centralized optimal path planning for this network with all-to-all classical communications, in which case the problem becomes a stochastic optimal control problem with a continuous action space. To overcome the computation and communication obstacles facing the centralized solutions, we also develop a distributed Pairwise Qubit Projection (PQP) algorithm, where pairs of nodes meet at a given time and respectively perform measurements at their geometric average. We show that the qubit states are driven to a consensus almost surely along the proposed PQP algorithm, and that the expected qubit density operators converge to the average of the network's initial values.

1 Introduction

Consensus seeking over complex networks has played a foundational role in the development of distributed computation and networked control systems [13, 8]. How a set of isolated processors communicating only by means of two-party messages reach a common state in the presence of faulty nodes was a prior concern for fault-tolerant distributed computation [16]. Distributed controller design that drives a network of autonomous agents to certain consensus state such as the network average or some leader's state [11] turned out to be a primary step towards control, estimation, and optimization of networked control systems [8]. In the past decades, tremendous research efforts have been devoted to efficient design and convergence analysis of consensus and synchronization algorithms motivated by various social, engineering, and physical systems, e.g., [5, 4, 12, 23, 10].

In particular, consensus over quantum networks where node states are in quantum space and algorithms must be implemented by feasible quantum means has drawn attention [14, 20]. Quantum particles

*G. Shi and M. R. James are with the Research School of Engineering, The Australian National University, ACT 0200, Canberra, Australia. Email: guodong.shi, matthew.james@anu.edu.au

†B. Li is with Key Lab of Mathematics Mechanization, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China. Email: libo@amss.ac.cn

‡Z. Miao and P. M. Dower are with Department of Electrical & Electronic Engineering, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria 3010, Australia. Email: zmiao, pdower@unimelb.edu.au

(subsystems) can be interconnected by local environments which are by themselves also quantum systems, the resulting state evolution will lead to a symmetric state consensus over such a quantum network, a concept introduced in [14]. The reduced states of the nodes will in turn asymptotically tend to the average of the nodes' initial reduced states, in the almost sure sense along the discrete algorithm proposed in [14] and deterministically along the master equation approach proposed in [20]. Such methods are essentially coherent quantum control for open quantum systems [19], where the involved local environments can only be engineered at a small scale. On the other hand, many types of quantum networks, especially quantum communication networks, are hybrid in the sense that both quantum and classical parts co-exist [1, 6]. Quantum operations (often being measurements) can be performed locally and then the outcomes of the measurements are exchanged via classical communications, leading to the so-called local-operation classical-communication (LOCC) networks which have served as protocols for quantum cryptography or potential tools for engineering complex quantum states [18]. Measurement-based quantum control has also been demonstrated as effective means of manipulating quantum states both theoretically and experimentally [17, 24, 9, 3].

In this paper, we consider a consensus seeking problem over a quantum hybrid network consisting of a number of nodes each holding a qubit, where projective measurements are applied and the measurement results are exchanged. The problem of centralized optimal path planning for the network with all-to-all classical communications is shown to be a stochastic optimal control problem, whose computation and communication complexities are analyzed. We also develop a distributed Pairwise Qubit Projection (PQP) algorithm, where pairs of nodes meet at a given time and respectively perform measurements at their geometric average. The qubit states are driven to a consensus almost surely along the proposed PQP algorithm. The expected qubit density operators actually converge to the average of the network's initial values, consistent with the work of [14, 20] for open quantum networks.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents some basic preliminaries on quantum states and measurements, and then introduces the considered hybrid quantum network model. Section 3 and Section 4 investigate centralized and distributed solutions to the considered qubit agreement problem, respectively. Finally a few concluding remarks are given in Section 5.

2 Preliminaries and The Model

In this section, we first present some preliminaries on quantum states and quantum measurements [15], and then introduce the hybrid quantum network model under investigation.

2.1 Quantum States and Measurements

The state space associated with any isolated quantum system is a complex vector space with inner product, i.e., a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The system is completely described by its state vector, which is a unit vector in the system's state space and often denoted by $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ known as the Dirac notation. For an open quantum

system, its state can also be described by a positive (i.e., positive semi-definite) Hermitian density operator ρ satisfying $\mathrm{tr}(\rho) = 1$. Let $\big(\cdot, \cdot\big)$ be the inner product equipped by the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Under Dirac notion this inner product is written as $\big(|\psi\rangle, |x\rangle\big) = \langle\psi|x\rangle$, where $\langle\psi|$ is the dual vector of $|\psi\rangle$. A quantum state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, induces a density operator, namely $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ by

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\Big(|x\rangle\Big) = \Big(\langle\psi|x\rangle\Big)|\psi\rangle,\ |x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Density operators provide a convenient description of *mixed states* as ensembles of pure states: If a quantum system is in state $|\psi_i\rangle$ with probability p_i where $\sum_i p_i = 1$, its density operator is

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|.$$

Any positive and Hermitian operator with trace one defines a proper density operator describing certain quantum state, and vice versa.

A projective measurement is described by an *observable* being a Hermitian operator over the state space $\mathcal{H}$ of the system being observed. Let the dimension of $\mathcal{H}$ be m and let O be an observable with nondegenerate spectrum, i.e., the eigenvalues $O_1, \ldots, O_m$ of O are distinct. Let $|1\rangle, \ldots, |m\rangle$ be the eigenvectors corresponding to eigenvalues $O_1, \ldots, O_m$ of O, respectively. As O is Hermitian, $|1\rangle, \ldots, |m\rangle$ form a complete basis of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. Consequently, $|\psi\rangle$ can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{m} c_j |j\rangle,$$

where the c_j are complex numbers satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{m} |c_j|^2 = 1$. Let a system be prepared in state $|\psi\rangle$ where the measurement O is performed. Then the outcome of such measurement is random taking value in $\{O_1, \ldots, O_m\}$, for which the probability of observe outcome O_j is

$$\mathbb{P}(O_j) = |c_j|^2.$$

Moreover, the state after the measurement becomes $|j\rangle$ if O_j is observed.

2.2 A Hybrid Quantum Network Model

Let a network of nodes be indexed in the set $\mathrm{V} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Each node holds a qubit, i.e., a quantum system whose state space $\mathcal{H}$ is a two-dimensional Hilbert space. Let $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ form an orthogonal basis of the qubit space $\mathcal{H}$. Projective measurements can be performed at the individual qubits, respectively. An available projective measurement M_α is described by its two eigenstates

$$\cos\alpha|0\rangle + \sin\alpha|1\rangle,$$

and

$$\cos\big(\alpha + \pi/2\big)|0\rangle + \sin\big(\alpha + \pi/2\big)|1\rangle.$$



Figure 1: An illustration of a six-node quantum hybrid network: There is a qubit at each node, respectively; Projective measurements are performed at the individual qubits; Nodes are interconnected by classical communication links so that the outcomes of the measurements can be exchanged.

We assume that the measurements are in the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \Big\{ \mathsf{M}_\alpha : \alpha \in [0, \pi/2) \Big\}.$$

The outcomes of a measurement M_α are indexed by $\ltimes$, corresponding to eigenstate $\cos\alpha|0\rangle + \sin\alpha|1\rangle$, and $\rtimes$, corresponding to eigenstate $\cos(\alpha+\pi/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\alpha+\pi/2)|1\rangle$. For the ease of presentation we will sometimes identify a measurement in the set $\mathcal{M}$ with its angle $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$ since there is a natural one-to-one correspondence between the elements in $\mathcal{M}$ and angles in the interval $[0, \pi/2)$.

Time is slotted for $t = 0, 1, \ldots$. The state space of the qubits $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ contains all possible outcomes of the measurements:

$$\mathcal{S} = \Big\{ \cos\alpha|0\rangle + \sin\alpha|1\rangle : \alpha \in [0, \pi) \Big\}.$$

The state of the qubit held by node i (or simply, qubit i) at time t is denoted by $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, noting that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a state in $\mathcal{S}$ and an angle in $[0, \pi)$, we will identify $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ with its angle whenever convenient. The network of nodes is interconnected by classical communications. At each time t, node i performs a measurement, denoted $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$ and selected in the set $\mathcal{M}$, whose outcomes can be exchanged via the classical communication links. The goal is to design efficient rules for the selection of the $\mathbf{u}_i(t)$, so that the $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ will tend to a common state.

We give an example of the considered hybrid quantum network with 6 nodes in Figure 1.

3 Centralized Solution

In this section, we investigate the scenario when the nodes are equipped with all-to-all classical communications and derive the optimal rules for measurement sequence selections at the qubits.

3.1 Finite Horizon

We stack the states of the qubits into an N dimensional column vector by $\mathbf{x}(t) = (\mathbf{x}_1(t) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{x}_N(t))^\top$. The vector $\mathbf{u}(t) = (\mathbf{u}_1(t) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{u}_N(t))^\top$ denotes the selection of measurements performed. The outcome of the

measurement $u_i(t)$ is $\mathbf{y}_i(t) \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}$. We also denote $\mathbf{y}(t) = (\mathbf{y}_1(t) \ \ldots \ \mathbf{y}_N(t))^\top$. Suppose the process ends at $t = T$ for some integer $T \geq 1$. The measurement selection decision is denoted by

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 \times \sigma_1 \cdots \times \sigma_{T-1}$$

where the σ_s assigning the value of $\mathbf{u}(s)$. The decision σ_s can depend on all information available by the time slot $s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, T-1\}$: $\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t)$ for $t = 0, \ldots, s$ and $\mathbf{u}(t)$ for $t = 0, \ldots, s-1$. Formally we have

$$\mathbf{u}(s) = \sigma_s\Big(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{y}(t), t = 0, \ldots, s; \ \mathbf{u}(t), t = 0, \ldots, s-1\Big)$$

with $\sigma_s(\cdot)$ can be an arbitrary function that takes values in $\mathcal{M}^N$ for $s = 0, 1, \ldots, T-1$. All such decisions σ are put in a set Υ_T.

For any fixed measurement decision σ, the agreement displacement at time T is characterized by the expected network fidelity:

$$f_\sigma(T) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \Big|\big\langle \mathbf{x}_i(T) \big| \mathbf{x}_j(T) \big\rangle\Big|$$

where $\mathbb{E}_\sigma$ captures all randomness generated by the quantum measurements as well as possible random measurement decisions. The evolution of node states is governed by the quantum measurement principles and can be written as

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = (y_1 \ \ldots \ y_N)^\top \big| \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)\Big) = \prod_i \big|\langle \mathbf{x}_i(t) \big| \mathbf{u}_i^{y_i}(t) \rangle\big|^2$$

where $\mathbf{u}_i^{y_i}(t) = \cos(\mathbf{u}_i(t))|0\rangle + \sin(\mathbf{u}_i(t))|1\rangle$ for $y_i = \ltimes$ and $\mathbf{u}_i^{y_i}(t) = \cos(\mathbf{u}_i(t) + \pi/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\mathbf{u}_i(t) + \pi/2)|1\rangle$ for $y_i = \rtimes$. By plain calculation we can further write

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = (y_1 \ \ldots \ y_N)^\top \big| \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t)\Big) = \prod_i \cos^2\big(\mathbf{u}_i^{y_i}(t) - \mathbf{x}_i(t)\big).$$

Here we have identified $\mathbf{u}_i^{y_i}(t)$ and $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ with their angles. Note that, the value and distribution of $\mathbf{x}(t+1)$ is fully determined by $\mathbf{y}(t)$ and $\mathbf{u}(t)$. This is to say $\mathbf{x}(t)$ is Markovian. Finding the policy σ that miximizes $f_\sigma(T)$ is a stochastic optimal control problem [2].

The optimal policy σ^* that maximizes $f_\sigma(T)$ can be obtained as follows. Clearly σ^* is Markovian in the sense that $\mathbf{u}(t)$ depends only on $\mathbf{x}(t)$ for all $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$ in the decision profile σ^*. Introduce $u = (u_1 \ \ldots \ u_N)^\top \in \mathcal{S}^N$ and $y = (y_1 \ \ldots \ y_N)^\top \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}^N$. Define a function $\mathbf{Q}(u, y) = (q_1 \ \ldots \ q_N)^\top \in \mathcal{S}^N$ by $q_i = u_i$ if $y_i = \ltimes$ and $q_i = u_i + \pi/2$ if $y_i = \rtimes$. Introduce the cost-to-go function $C(\cdot, \cdot) : \mathcal{S}^N \times \{0, 1, \ldots, T\} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$C(x, t) = \max_{\sigma \in \Upsilon_T} \mathbb{E}_\sigma\big(\sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \big|\big\langle \mathbf{x}_i(T) \big| \mathbf{x}_j(T) \big\rangle\big| \big| \mathbf{x}(t) = x\big).$$

Then by a standard dynamic programming argument there holds

$$C(x, t) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{M}^N} \sum_{y \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}^N} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = y \big| \mathbf{x}(t) = x, \mathbf{u}(t) = u\Big) \cdot C(\mathbf{Q}(u, y), t+1) \tag{1}$$

for $x \in \mathcal{S}^N$ and $t = 0, 1, \ldots, T-1$. The boundary condition of (1) is

$$C(x, T) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \Big|\langle x_i | x_j \rangle\Big|, \ x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^\top \in \mathcal{S}^N.$$

The optimal decision σ^* is given by

$$\sigma_t^*(\mathbf{x}(t)) = \arg\max_{u \in \mathcal{M}^N} \sum_{y \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}^N} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = y \Big| \mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{u}(t) = u\Big) \cdot C(\mathbf{Q}(u, y), t+1) \tag{2}$$

for $t = 0, \ldots, T-1$.

3.2 Infinite Horizon

Next, we consider an infinite horizon scenario when the optimality criteria is given by the minimal steps in expectation required for reaching a perfect agreement in the network. Let

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 \times \sigma_1 \times \ldots$$

be a measurement selection policy for the entire time horizon, where for any $s = 0, 1, \ldots,$ σ_s maps to $\mathcal{M}^N$ from all available information up to time s. All such decisions are put in the set Υ_∞. Consider the expected number of steps of reaching agreement at the qubits:

$$g_\sigma = \mathbb{E}_\sigma\Big(\inf_t \Big\{t \geq 0 : \ \mathbf{x}_1(t) = \cdots = \mathbf{x}_N(t)\Big\}\Big).$$

Clearly there exist simple policies in Υ_∞ under which g_σ will be a finite number. We are interested in the optimal one that minimizes g_σ.

Recall the definition of $\mathbf{Q}(u, y)$. Similarly, the optimal policy σ^* that minimizes g_σ is Markovian. In fact, it is also stationary in the sense that $\sigma_t^*(\mathbf{x}(t) = x) = \sigma_s^*(\mathbf{x}(s) = x)$ for all $s, t \geq 0$. Define cost-to-go function

$$G(x) := \min_{\sigma \in \Upsilon_\infty} \mathbb{E}_\sigma\Big(\inf_s \Big\{s \geq 0 : \ \mathbf{x}_1(s+t) = \cdots = \mathbf{x}_N(s+t)\Big\}\Big| \mathbf{x}(t) = x\Big).$$

In this case the function $G(x)$ satisfies the following equation [22]

$$G(x) = 1 + \min_{u \in \mathcal{M}^N} \sum_{y \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}^N} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = y \Big| \mathbf{x}(t) = x, \mathbf{u}(t) = u\Big) G(\mathbf{Q}(u, y)). \tag{3}$$

The optimal decision σ^* is given by

$$\sigma_t^*(\mathbf{x}(t) = x) = \arg\min_{u \in \mathcal{M}^N} \sum_{y \in \{\ltimes, \rtimes\}^N} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathbf{y}(t) = y \Big| \mathbf{x}(t) = x, \mathbf{u}(t) = u\Big) G(\mathbf{Q}(u, y)). \tag{4}$$

3.3 Computation/Communication Complexities

We would like to point out that the derived optimal network-level rules are conceptually equivalent to the single qubit framework presented in [9]. Although the centralized optimal solutions are clear in theory

for both finite and infinite time horizons, it is important to understand the amount of computation and communication resources required for implementing them in practice for a considerably large network.

The Bellman equations (1) and (3) involve a continuous action set $\mathcal{M}^N$. Usually this is approximated by a proper discretization of $\mathcal{M}$ into a finite set. For example, we can let the measurements be selected from [17]

$$\mathsf{M}_\alpha : \alpha = \frac{j\pi}{2K},\ j = 0, \ldots, K-1. \tag{5}$$

This of course means that the resulting policy becomes potentially suboptimal due to smaller action space. However it is reasonable to believe that a large K would produce policies that can approximate the optimal solution.

Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ has been discretized into a finite set with K elements. Note that this means that the state space $\mathcal{S}$ for each qubit is also discretized with $2K$ elements. We now discuss the finite horizon case in detail. From the computational side, solving the Bellman equation (1) relies on recursively along the equation (1) computing $C(x,t)$ (and therefore obtain the optimal $\sigma_t^*(x)$) from $C(x,t+1)$ for all $t = T-1, \ldots, 0$ and all $x \in \mathcal{S}^N$, starting with the boundary condition

$$C(x,T) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left|\langle x_i | x_j \rangle\right| = \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \left|\cos(x_i - x_j)\right|^2.$$

The number of algebraic operations required in such process inevitably grows faster than K^N. Therefore, practically it is almost impossible to numerically solve the Bellman equation (1) and obtain the optimal policy for a large network. In fact, even if the computation can be done off line, preserving the optimal policy relies on $O((2K)^N T \log K)$ bits of memory. Since each node relies on the states of all other nodes to carry out the optimal policy, the network requires all-to-all communications with $O\big(N^2\big)$ bits of transmissions per step.

4 Distributed Solution

In this section, we discuss distributed solutions to the considered qubit consensus problem in the sense that nodes communicate with a few neighbours locally and then make measurement selection decisions individually.

4.1 The Algorithm

We assume that there is a connected underlying graph $\mathrm{G} = (\mathrm{V}, \mathrm{E})$ with node set V and edge set E representing the classical communication links among the nodes, where a link $\{i,j\} \in \mathrm{E}$ specifies that nodes i and j can exchange information their states. We denote $\mathrm{N}_i := \{j : \{i,j\} \in \mathrm{E}\}$ as the neighbour set of node i. We also define

$$a \mod \pi/2 = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in [0, \pi/2), \\ a - \pi/2 & \text{if } a \in [\pi/2, \pi) \end{cases}$$

and

$$a \mod \pi = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in [0, \pi), \\ a - \pi & \text{if } a \in [\pi, 2\pi). \end{cases}$$

We propose the following algorithm.

Pairwise Qubit Projection (PQP). (i) At each t, a node i is drawn uniformly at random from the set V, and then node j is selected uniformly at random from the set N_i; (ii) The selected pair of nodes i and j exchanges their current states $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ and $\mathbf{x}_j(t)$; (iii) Nodes i and j apply projective measurements

$$\mathbf{u}_i(t) = \mathbf{u}_j(t) = (\mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{x}_j(t))/2 \mod \pi/2$$

and all other nodes keep their current states.

We remark that the above algorithm is clearly inspired by the class of gossiping algorithms for classical communication networks and open quantum networks [5, 14, 21]. This proposed algorithm can be realized in fully distributed manner in the sense that nodes even need not to share a common clock and can simply follow independent Poisson processes to wake up [5]. Moreover, the pair section process can also be made deterministic and multiple disjoint pairs can be selected at a given time, which will not change the nature of the algorithm and actually can speed up the algorithm. The involved projective measurements introduce new type of randomness in the algorithm, which makes the PQP algorithm differ from the previous algorithms [5, 14, 21] at a fundamental level.

4.2 State Evolution

Let $\mathbf{x}(t)$ be driven by the proposed PQP algorithm. Suppose node pair $\{i, j\}$ is selected at time t. Then from the quantum measurement postulate, independently among $m \in \{i, j\}$ we have

$$\mathbf{x}_m(t+1) = \frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}$$

with probability $\cos^2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}$, and

$$\mathbf{x}_m(t+1) = \frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t) + \mathbf{x}_j(t) + \pi}{2} \mod \pi$$

with probability $\sin^2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}$. The following result holds.

Theorem 1 *Using the PQP algorithm, the hybrid quantum network reaches an agreement almost surely in the sense that*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\lim_{t \to \infty} |\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)| = 0 \Big) = 1$$

for all $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$.

We defer the proof of Theorem 1 to the end of this section.

For the hybrid quantum network illustrated in Figure 1, we plot a sample path at which consensus is reached and the trajectories of the expected states of the qubits, respectively, in Figure 2 and Figure 3.



Figure 2: A sample path of $\mathbf{x}_i(t), i = 1, \ldots, 6$ along the PQP algorithm with initial value $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = \pi/2$.



Figure 3: Trajectories of $x_i(t) := \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i(t)), i = 1, \ldots, 6$ along the PQP algorithm with initial value $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = \pi/2$.



Figure 4: Trajectories of $D_i(t), i = 1, \ldots, 6$ along the PQP algorithm with initial value $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_1(0) = \mathbf{x}_2(0) = \mathbf{x}_3(0) = \pi/2$.

4.3 Density Evolution

Now we introduce $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)$ as the density operator corresponding to $\mathbf{x}_i(t) \in \mathcal{S}$. Viewing also $\mathbf{x}_i(t)$ as its angle in $[0, \pi)$, we can formally write:

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos^2 \mathbf{x}_i(t) & \cos \mathbf{x}_i(t) \sin \mathbf{x}_i(t) \\ \cos \mathbf{x}_i(t) \sin \mathbf{x}_i(t) & \sin^2 \mathbf{x}_i(t) \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

We also define $\rho_i(t) = \mathbb{E}\{\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)\}$, where $\mathbb{E}$ is subject to the classical measure $\mathbb{P}$ capturing all randomness in the node pair selection process and in the quantum projective measurements. Note that $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)$ is always a pure state. All the outcomes of the projective measurements have to be read out for carrying out the algorithm. Nonetheless $\rho_i(t)$ describes the distribution of $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)$ under the measure $\mathbb{P}$. We stack $\boldsymbol{\rho}(t) = (\boldsymbol{\rho}_1(t) \ \ldots \ \boldsymbol{\rho}_N(t))^\top$ and $\rho(t) = (\rho_1(t) \ \ldots \ \rho_N(t))^\top$ as vectors of 2×2 density operators.

It turned out that it is more convenient to investigate the evolution of the $\mathbf{x}(t)$ from the corresponding density operators, whose original update is in fact rather complex. Let L_{G} be the Laplacian of the graph G, defined by $[L_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} = -(1/|\mathrm{N}_i| + 1/|\mathrm{N}_j|)$ for $\{i, j\} \in \mathrm{E}$, $[L_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$ with $\{i, j\} \notin \mathrm{E}$, and $[L_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ii} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} [L_{\mathrm{G}}]_{ij}$. We have the following result.

Theorem 2 *The density vector sequence* $\big(\rho(t)\big)_{t \geq 0}$ *satisfies*

$$\rho(t+1) = \big(I_N - L_{\mathrm{G}}\big) \otimes I_2 \rho(t), \ t \geq 0.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \rho_i(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \rho_i(0)}{N}, \ i \in \mathrm{V}$$

with an exponential rate at $1 - \lambda_2(L_{\mathrm{G}})$*, where* $\lambda_2(L_{\mathrm{G}})$ *is the smallest positive eigenvalue of* L_{G}*.*

Proof. Suppose node pair $\{i,j\}$ is selected at time t. Then based on (6), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\big\{\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t+1)\big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\big\} &= \mathbb{E}\big\{\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t+1)\big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\big\} \\
&= \cos^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)-\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\cos^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2} & \cos\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\sin\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\\ \cos\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\sin\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2} & \sin^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\end{bmatrix} \\
&+ \sin^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)-\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\sin^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2} & -\cos\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\sin\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\\ -\cos\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\sin\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2} & \cos^2\frac{\mathbf{x}_i(t)+\mathbf{x}_j(t)}{2}\end{bmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\cos^2\mathbf{x}_i(t) & \cos\mathbf{x}_i(t)\sin\mathbf{x}_i(t)\\ \cos\mathbf{x}_i(t)\sin\mathbf{x}_i(t) & \sin^2\mathbf{x}_i(t)\end{bmatrix} + \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix}\cos^2\mathbf{x}_j(t) & \cos\mathbf{x}_j(t)\sin\mathbf{x}_j(t)\\ \cos\mathbf{x}_j(t)\sin\mathbf{x}_j(t) & \sin^2\mathbf{x}_j(t)\end{bmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t), \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality holds from elementary sum-to-product trigonometric formulas.

We further obtain

$$\rho(t+1) = \big(I_N - L_{\mathrm{G}}\big)\otimes I_2\rho(t).$$

by collecting all events at the pairs of nodes. The convergence statement aligns with the same argument as used in [5]. This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 2 shows that in the operator space, $\mathbb{E}\{\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\}$ simply follows a linear time-invariant system and eventually leads to an average consensus. This result is related but also in contrast to the work of [14, 20], which showed that a network of qubits interconnected by local environments can be driven to a consensus of their individual reduced states. The evolution of $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{x}(t)\}$ is on the other hand highly complex for which even a nonlinear recursive form is out of reach.

An illustration of Theorem 2 is presented below for the hybrid quantum network in Figure 4, where we plot

$$D_i(t) := \Big\|\rho_i(t) - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \rho_i(0)}{N}\Big\|_2$$

for $i = 1,\ldots,6$, respectively.

4.4 Proof of Theorem 1

Define $p_{ij} = (1/|\mathrm{N}_i| + 1/|\mathrm{N}_j|)$ for $\{i,j\} \in \mathrm{E}$ as the probability of link $\{i,j\}$ being selected at a given time. Introduce $\mathbf{h}(t) := \sum_{\{i,j\}:i<j} \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t)\big)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{h}(t+1)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{\{k,m\}\in\mathrm{E}} p_{km}\mathbb{E}_{km}\Big(\mathbf{h}(t+1)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big)\\
&= \sum_{\{k,m\}\in\mathrm{E}} p_{km}\mathbb{E}_{km}\bigg[\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t+1)\big) + \sum_{\{i,j\}:i<j,\{i,j\}\neq\{k,m\}} \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t+1)\big)\bigg|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\bigg]\\
&= \sum_{\{k,m\}\in\mathrm{E}} p_{km}\bigg(\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t+1)\big)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big] + \mathrm{Tr}\bigg[\sum_{\{i,j\}:i<j,\{i,j\}\neq\{k,m\}} \mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t+1)\big)\bigg|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\bigg]\bigg)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where in the first equality the $\mathbb{E}_{km}$ is subject to the randomness generated by quantum measurements at nodes k and m, and in the last equality we have used the fact that trace and expectation commute due to their linearity.

Proceeding with the first of the two trace terms in the right-hand side of (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Tr}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t+1)\big)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big]\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t+1)\big)\mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t+1)\big)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big]\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\Big)\Big(\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t) + \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\Big)\\
&= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\Big),
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the first equality is due to independence of the outcome of the quantum measurements at nodes k and m, and the second equality utilizes (7). Meanwhile, considering the second trace term in the right-hand side of (8), it is easy to conclude from (7) that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\bigg[\sum_{\{i,j\}:i<j,\{i,j\}\neq\{k,m\}} \mathbb{E}_{km}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t+1)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t+1)\big)\bigg|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\bigg] = \sum_{\{i,j\}:i<j,\{i,j\}\neq\{k,m\}} \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_i(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_j(t)\big). \tag{10}$$

As a result, from (8), (9) and (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{h}(t+1)\Big|\boldsymbol{\rho}(t)\Big) &= \sum_{\{k,m\}\in\mathrm{E}} p_{km}\bigg[\mathbf{h}(t) + \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)\Big)\bigg]\\
&= \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{t}) + \sum_{\{k,m\}\in\mathrm{E}} \frac{p_{km}}{2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big) \leq 1$ always holds, (11) implies that $\big\{\mathbf{h}(t)\big\}$ is a submartingale. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}\big(\mathbf{h}(t)\big) \leq N(N-1)/2$ for all t by the definition of $\mathbf{h}(t)$. By the Martingale Convergence Theorem (Theorem 5.2.8, [7]), $\mathbf{h}(t)$ converges to a finite limit almost surely. We can further invoke the Dominated Convergence

Theorem (e.g., Exercise 2.3.7, [7]) to yield that, $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{h}(t))$ converges to a finite limit. Hence, (11) implies

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{h}(t+1)\Big) = \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbf{h}(t)\Big) + \mathbb{E}\bigg[\sum_{\{k,m\}\in \mathrm{E}} \frac{p_{km}}{2}\Big(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)\Big)\bigg],$$

so $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)\Big) = 1$ for all $\{k,m\} \in \mathrm{E}$. However, as $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big) \leq 1$ is a sure event, we conclude for any $\epsilon > 0$ that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\Big(\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big) \geq 1 - \epsilon\Big) = 1, \tag{12}$$

i.e., $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)$ converges to 1 in probability for all $\{k,m\} \in \mathrm{E}$.

Finally, we notice that $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big) = \cos^2(\mathbf{x}_k(t) - \mathbf{x}_m(t))$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Tr}\big(\boldsymbol{\rho}_k(t)\boldsymbol{\rho}_m(t)\big)$ converging to one in probability is equivalent to that $\mathbf{x}_k(t) - \mathbf{x}_m(t)$ converging to zero in probability. While G is a connected graph, we further know that $\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)$ converges to zero in probability for all $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$. This immediately implies that $\mathbf{h}(t)$ will converge to $N(N-1)/2$ in probability. However, we have known as a fact that $\mathbf{h}(t)$ converges in the almost sure sense. Therefore, $\mathbf{h}(t)$ must converge to $N(N-1)/2$ almost surely, or equivalently, $\mathbf{x}_i(t) - \mathbf{x}_j(t)$ converging to zero almost surely for all $i, j \in \mathrm{V}$. The desired theorem holds and we have now completed the proof.

5 Conclusions

We have considered a consensus seeking problem over a quantum hybrid network. A number of nodes each holding a qubit apply projective measurements and the measurement results are exchanged via classical communications. Centralized optimal path planning for the network with all-to-all classical communications were derived by stochastic optimal control approach, whose overwhelming computation and communication complexities were shown for a large network. A distributed Pairwise Qubit Projection (PQP) algorithm was also proposed along which the qubit states can be driven to a consensus almost surely along the proposed PQP algorithm. Future work includes generalization of the optimal control and distributed control approaches to hybrid quantum networks in the presence of quantum links as entangled pairs for improving the efficiency and scalability of such networks in applications.

References

[1] A. Acin, J. I. Cirac, and M. Lewenstein. Entanglement percolation in quantum networks. *Nature*, 3:539–543, 2007.

[2] D. P. Bertsekas and S. E. Shreve. *Stochastic optimal control: The discrete time case*, volume 23. Academic Press New York, 1978.

[3] M. S. Blok, C. Bonato, M. L. Markham, D. J. Twitchen, V. V. Dobrovitski, and R. Hanson. Manipulating a qubit through the backaction of sequential partial measurements and real-time feedback. *Nature Physics*, 10:189–193, 2014.

[4] S. Boyd, P. Diaconis, and L. Xiao. Fastest mixing Markov chain on a graph. *SIAM Review*, 46(4):667–689, 2004.

[5] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah. Randomized gossip algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 14:2508–2530, June 2006.

[6] M. Cuquet and J. Calsamiglia. Entanglement percolation in quantum complex networks. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 103:240503, Dec 2009.

[7] R. Durrett. *Probability Theory: Theory and Examples.* 4th ed. Cambridge University Press: New York, 2010.

[8] M. Egerstedt and M. Mesbahi. *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks.* Princeton University Press, 2010.

[9] S. Fu, G. Shi, A. Proutiere, and M. R. James. Feedback policies for measurement-based quantum state manipulation. *Physical Review A*, 90:062328, 2014.

[10] B. Golub and M. O. Jackson. Naive learning in social networks and the wisdom of crowds. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, 2:112–149, 2010.

[11] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse. Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48:988–1001, 2003.

[12] S. Kar and J. M. F. Moura. Distributed consensus algorithms in sensor networks: Quantized data and random link failures. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 58(3):1383–1400, 2010.

[13] N.A. Lynch. *Distributed Algorithms.* Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, CA, 1996.

[14] L. Mazzarella, A. Sarlette, and F. Ticozzi. Consensus for quantum networks: from symmetry to gossip iterations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 60(1):158–172, 2015.

[15] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information.* Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[16] M. Pease, R. Shostak, and L. Lamport. Reaching agreement in the presence of faults. *Journal of the ACM*, 27(2):228–234, April 1980.

[17] A. Pechen, F. Shuang N. Il'in, and H. Rabitz. Quantum control by von Neumann measurements. *Physical Review A*, 74:052102, 2006.

[18] S. Perseguers, M. Lewenstein, A. Acin, and J. I. Cirac. Quantum random networks. *Nature Physics*, 6:539–543, 2010.

[19] Á. Rivas and S. F. Huelga. *Open Quantum Systems: An Introduction.* Springer Briefs in Physics. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.

[20] G. Shi, D. Dong, I. R. Petersen, and K. H. Johansson. Reaching a quantum consensus: Master equations that generate symmetrization and synchronization. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61(2):374–387, 2016.

[21] G. Shi, B. Li, M. Johansson, and K. H. Johansson. Finite-time convergent gossiping. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, in press, 2016.

[22] D. P. Bertsekas and J. N. Tsitsiklis. An analysis of stochastic shortest path problems. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 16(3): 580–595, 1991.

[23] T. Vicsek, A. Czirok, E. B. Jacob, I. Cohen, and O. Schochet. Novel type of phase transitions in a system of self-driven particles. *Physical Review Letters*, 75:1226–1229, 1995.

[24] H. M. Wiseman. Quantum control: Squinting at quantum systems. *Nature*, 470(7333):178–179, 2011.